

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application based on the foregoing amendments and following remarks. By this Amendment, claims 1, 9, 16 and 24 have been amended, and claims 43-45 have been canceled. Claims 1-2, 4-6, 9, 11-13, 16-17, 19-21, 24, 26-28, and 31-33 and 46-49 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103 in view of Kaplan and Rosenthal

Claims 1-2, 4, 6, 9, 11, 13, 16-17, 19, 21, 24, 26, 28, 31 and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,970,405 to Kaplan et al. ("Kaplan") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,737,701 to Rosenthal et al. ("Rosenthal"). For reasons set forth more fully below, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants have amended independent claim 1 (with similar amendments in each of the other independent claims 9, 16, and 24) to incorporate subject matter that was previously found in herewith-canceled claims 43-45. Among other things, the claims now even more clearly require:

1. The requested resource identifier includes a telephone number dialed by the requesting party
2. Augmenting HLR/VLR services of a mobile telephone service with the system-wide list and the separate and distinct plurality of lists
3. Comparing, using the augmented HLR/VLR services, the dialed telephone number with the plurality of identifiers in the system-wide list
4. Extracting an International Mobile Subscriber Identity (IMSI) associated with the request, and
5. Retrieving the list associated with the specific subscriber by consulting the HLR portion of the augmented HLR/VLR services using the extracted IMSI

The Office Action did not allege that the specific subject matter of claims 43-45 was found in the alleged combination of just Kaplan and Rosenthal. Indeed, Kaplan and Rosenthal describe systems that use MIN/ESN rather than IMSI, as required by the currently amended claims, and do not relate to GSM systems. For example, Kaplan is specifically directed to

improving an analog system that relies on fingerprint analysis to authenticate a wireless handset in addition to MIN/ESN, which is inapplicable to GSM systems.

More importantly, neither Kaplan nor Rosenthal suggests augmenting HLR/VLR services with the fraud control lists of the present invention. For example, claim 1 requires “wherein the concurrently maintaining step includes augmenting HLR/VLR services of a mobile telephone service with the system-wide list and the separate and distinct plurality of lists.”

The Office Action relies on Sanchez as meeting the limitations of claims 43 and 44. However, Sanchez merely describes a system that prevent unauthorized call forwarding when a person is roaming in a network in a different network. Sanchez teaches that when a request for forwarding is received from a roaming mobile subscriber, the VLR of the roaming network opens a MAP communications link with the HLR of the roaming subscriber’s home network to determine whether to allow forwarding for the roaming subscriber. Nowhere does Sanchez teach or suggest storing or maintaining augmented lists of fraud control information in the VLR of the roaming network, much less with lists required by the amended independent claims.

For at least these reasons, amended independent claims 1, 9, 16 and 24 patentably define over the cited prior art, and the § 103 rejections thereof should be withdrawn, together with claims 2, 4, 6, 11, 13, 17, 19, 21, 26, 28, 31 and 32 that depend therefrom.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103 in view of Havinis, Rosenthal and other References

Claims 5, 12, 20, 27 and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Kaplan and Rosenthal in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,330,311 Mijares et al. (“Mijares”). Claim 32 stands rejected as being allegedly unpatentable over Kaplan and Rosenthal in view of Rudokas, U.S. Patent No. 5,420,910 (“Rudokas”). Claims 43-46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaplan and Rosenthal, and further in view of Sanchez, U.S. Patent No. 6,091,949 (“Sanchez”). Claims 47-49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaplan, Rosenthal and Sanchez and further in view of Mijares. For reasons set forth more fully below, these rejections are respectfully traversed.


Claims 43-45 have been canceled herewith, rendering the rejection thereof moot.

The remaining claims depend ultimately from independent claims 1, 9, 16, and 24 and thus are patentable for at least the reasons presented above. The deficiencies noted above are not

cured by the alleged combinations with Mijares, Rowell, or Rudokas. For example, neither Mijares, Rowell, nor Rudokas teach or suggest augmenting HLR/VLR services with concurrently maintained system-wide list of resource identifiers and user specific lists of resource identifiers as required by amended independent claims 1, 9, 16, and 24.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. If any issues remain which the Examiner feels may be resolved through a telephone interview, s/he is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,
PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP
Date: July 7, 2008  40,580
Mark J. Danielson Reg. No.
(650) 233-4777
Please reply to customer no. 27,498